

1 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
2 Attorney General
3 ERIN L. ALBRIGHT
4 Deputy Attorney General #9953
5 State of Nevada
6 Bureau of Litigation
7 Public Safety Division
8 100 N. Carson Street
9 Carson City, NV 89701-4717
10 Tel: (775) 684-1257
11 E-mail: ealbright@ag.nv.gov

12 *Attorneys for Defendants*
13 *Ira Brannon and Christopher Smith*

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

15 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

16 JOSEPH L. MIZZONI,
17 Plaintiff,
18 vs.
19 STATE OF NEVADA, et al.,
20 Defendants.

21 Case No. 3:15-cv-00499-MMD-WGC

22 **MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER
23 SEAL EXHIBITS H AND I, CONSISTING OF
24 PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFF'S AND
25 DEFENDANT SMITH'S MEDICAL
26 RECORDS, UNDER SEAL**

27 Defendants, Ira Brannon and Christopher Smith, by and through counsel, Adam Paul Laxalt,
28 Attorney General of the State of Nevada, and Erin L. Albright, Deputy Attorney General, hereby submit
their Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Exhibits H and I, Consisting of Portions of Plaintiff's and
Defendant Smith's Medical Records, Under Seal.

This Motion is based on the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities and the papers and
pleadings on file herein.

29 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

30 **I. INTRODUCTION**

31 Defendants seek leave to file Exhibits H and I, consisting of portions of Plaintiff's and
32 Defendant Smith's medical records under seal. Specifically, these exhibits contain the medical
33 evaluation performed on both Plaintiff and Defendant Smith after the March 28, 2015 incident involved
34 in this matter.

35 ///

1 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

2 LR IA 10-5(a) requires papers filed with the Court under seal to be accompanied by a motion
 3 for leave to file those documents under seal. *See LR IA 10-5(a)*. Courts have recognized a general
 4 right of the public to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and
 5 documents. *See Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal
 6 citation omitted). The strong presumption of public access must be overcome by a party seeking to seal
 7 a judicial record. *See Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096 (9th Cir. 2016)
 8 (citing *Kamakana*, 447 F.3d at 1178). This is a stringent standard, and a party must demonstrate ““a
 9 compelling reason and [articulate] a factual basis . . . without relying on hypothesis or conjecture” to
 10 justify sealing court records. *See Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1096–97. The “compelling reason”
 11 standard applies to any motion “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case[,]” but especially
 12 applies to dispositive motions. *See id.* at 1100–01. What constitutes a compelling reason is within the
 13 discretion of the District Court, including items that could ““gratify private spite or promote public
 14 scandal[.]”” *See id.* at 1097.

15 **III. DISCUSSION**

16 Defendants seek leave to file Plaintiff’s and Defendant Smith’s medical records under seal
 17 because these items contain sensitive information controlled by prison regulations. In the prison
 18 context, certain items of information have the unique and dangerous potential to expose either Plaintiff
 19 or prison staff members to physical, emotional, financial, or other harm. Former NDOC Director James
 20 “Greg” Cox (Cox) explained the rationale behind prison information confidentiality policies in a prior
 21 case before the Court. *See generally* Exh. A (Declaration of Greg Cox¹). Cox states that these policies
 22 often protect the privacy of inmates diagnosed with “embarrassing or shunned diseases and alcohol and/
 23 drug” addiction. *Id.* at 2. By preventing inmates from obtaining copies of their medical records,
 24 another inmate cannot “forcibly take such records from the inmate, which could cause subsequent harm

25 ¹ Cox’s declaration was previously filed on December 5, 2011, in *McCabe v. Gibbons, et al.*, case number 3:09-cv-
 26 00244-LRH-RAM. *See* (ECF No. 72) therein. Director Cox’s declaration supported the defendants’ Brief Addressing the
 27 Confidentiality and Safety and Security Issues Pertaining to Inmate Medical Records. Similar circumstances exist in the
 28 instant case, and Cox’s declaration applies with equal force here, as the rationale behind NDOC’s policies regarding inmate
 medical records remains unchanged. At page 2, Cox states that the Administrative Regulations and Medical Directives are
 attached as exhibits. Although the regulations and directives have been amended since Cox made this declaration, the
 substance of the current rules does not materially differ from that of the former rules.

1 to the inmate or to the security, discipline, and good order of the prison.” *Id.* at 3. To illustrate, Cox
 2 stresses that stolen medical records could reveal that an inmate has AIDS, leprosy, hepatitis, or a
 3 sexually transmitted disease, “which could cause a number of classification, security, and housing
 4 problems; inmates’ ostracism of the inflicted [sic] inmate; and/or demands by cellmates for transfer and
 5 the alternative of single-celling of the inmate, although there is no real medical risk.” *Id.* Cox further
 6 explains that stolen inmate medical records could show certain medicines that the inmate receives and
 7 cause the inmate to endure pressure from other inmates who wish to illicitly obtain the medicines. *Id.*
 8 Finally, Cox states that stolen medical records may indicate a physical disability “that could put the
 9 inmate at risk for increased victimization due to knowledge of weakened physical ability.” *Id.* at 4.
 10 Original institutional incident reports can expose the same sensitive inmate health information, and also
 11 provide information that inmates could use or distribute for the purposes of blackmail, extortion, or
 12 physical attack of prison staff members. This material has great potential to “gratify private spite or
 13 promote public scandal” in the prison context. *See Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097.

14 Courts generally defer to the judgment of prison officials in matters of security. *Bell v. Wolfish*,
 15 441 U.S. 520, 547 (1979) (explaining that “[p]rison administrators . . . should be accorded wide-ranging
 16 deference in the adoption and execution of policies and practices that in the judgment are needed to
 17 preserve internal order and discipline and maintain institutional security”). *See also Norwood v. Vance*,
 18 591 F.3d 1062, 1066 (9th Cir. 2009) (“It is well established that judges and juries must defer to prison
 19 officials’ expert judgments.”). The Plaintiff’s and Defendant Smith’s medical records at issue in this
 20 case are confidential documents pursuant to NRS 629.061 and Nevada Department of Corrections
 21 (NDOC) Administrative Regulations (ARs) 568, 569, 639, as well as the federal Health Insurance
 22 Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA). While a plaintiff may waive HIPAA confidentiality,
 23 Plaintiff in this case has not provided such a waiver.

24 Accordingly, Exhibits H and I, consisting of Plaintiff’s and Defendant Smith’s medical records,
 25 should be filed under seal to prevent their entry into the public record and to protect Plaintiff’s
 26 confidentiality and institutional safety and security. Filing these Exhibits under seal will not prejudice
 27 Plaintiff because copies of these exhibits will be provided to the warden’s office of the facility where he
 28 is housed, and he may send institutional correspondence (kite) to review the exhibits. Inmates cannot

1 possess confidential medical or other documents pursuant to the aforementioned regulations in their
2 cells, so this is the proper procedure.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 Because of the unique safety and security concerns presented by the prison context, compelling
5 reasons (as described above) justify the filing of certain records under seal. For these reasons,
6 Defendants respectfully request this Court grant their Motion for Leave to File Exhibits H and I,
7 Consisting of Plaintiff's and Defendant Smith's Medical Records, Under Seal.

8 Dated this 16th day of November 2017.

9 ADAM PAUL LAXALT
10 Attorney General

11 By: 
12 ERIN L. ALBRIGHT
13 Deputy Attorney General
Bureau of Litigation
Public Safety Division

14 *Attorneys for Defendants*

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Attorney General, State of Nevada, and that on this 16th day of November 2017, I caused to be deposited for mailing a true and correct copy of the foregoing, **MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL EXHIBITS H AND I, CONSISTING OF PORTIONS OF PLAINTIFF'S AND DEFENDANT SMITH'S MEDICAL RECORDS, UNDER SEAL**, to the following:

JOSEPH L. MIZZONI #68549
HIGH DESERT STATE PRISON
P.O. BOX 650
INDIAN SPRINGS, NV 89070

An employee of the
Office of the Attorney General